

**REMARKS**

Initially, in the Office Action dated March 17, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,870,683 (Wells et al.). Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14, 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,202 (Hawkins et al.) and in further view of Gif Construction Set Professional Manual (GCSPM) and the GIF Construction Set Professional Homepage (GCSPH). Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. in view of Hawkins et al. and GCSPM, in further view of the applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA).

**35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wells et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Wells et al. discloses a wireless mobile station, such as a cellular telephone, that executes a method to selectively display one of a plurality of graphical information sequences on a display of the mobile station. The graphical information sequence is displayed during an idle state of the mobile station, that is, when the mobile station is not involved in receiving a call or during a call. The user interface of the mobile station is adapted to enable the user to selectively enable or disable the display of a graphical information sequence and/or select a graphical information sequence to be displayed from a plurality of pre-stored graphical information

sequences, and/or input a definition of a graphical information sequence from an external source for storage in the mobile station.

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Applicants submit that Wells et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, inter alia, a wireless handheld communication device that includes editing at least one image in the wireless handheld communication device prior to the generating of an animation where the editing includes at least one of adding movement, changing individual pixels, or adding text. The Examiner asserts that Wells et al. discloses editing of at least one of the images in a wireless handheld communication device at col. 5, lines 35-38, where the Examiner asserts that "the content of the parameter influences (edits) the final animation which is to be generated". However, this portion of Wells et al. merely discloses that an animation-parameter can be passed to the animation at run time and that this animation-parameter may be text characters used in an animation. This is not editing of at least one of the images in a wireless handheld communication device prior to the generating of the animation, the editing including at least one of adding movement, changing individual pixels, and adding text, as recited in the claims of the present application. Wells et al. does not disclose or suggest editing at least one image where the editing includes adding movement, or changing individual pixels. This disclosure in Wells et al. merely discloses text characters being passed to the animation in an animation-parameter.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 8 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Wells et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14, 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. in view of Hawkins et al. and further in view of GCSPM and GCSPH. The deficiencies of GCSPM and GCSPH were discussed in Applicants' previously-filed response and Applicants resubmit all remarks submitted in that response. Applicants provide the following additional remarks.

Hawkins et al. discloses mobile computer system design for wireless communication expansion where an organizer that may receive a cellular portion to form a cellular telephone is provided. An organizer comprises an organizer component, including a microphone. The organizer further includes an area for receiving an additional component. The area is designed to receive a cellular component and a connection element is designed to mate the microphone in the organizer component with the cellular component, to use the organizer as a part of a cellular telephone.

Regarding claim 17, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest, or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claim of, inter alia, a wireless handheld communication device that includes a display where the display is capable of displaying a sequence of images for animation and an animation menu for a user of the wireless handheld communication device that includes an edit images menu that allows pixel-wise editing of images. The Examiner asserts that the claimed preamble is not given patentable weight because it is not incorporated in the body of the claim. Applicants do not understand this assertion. The claim relates to a wireless handheld communication device with the recited limitations. These same limitations existing on some totally unrelated device, for example, an automobile, would not render the limitations in this claim unpatentable. In any event, for clarification, a wireless handheld communication device is now recited in the body of the claim.

Moreover, none of the cited references disclose or suggest an edit images menu that allows pixel-wise editing of images. The Examiner merely asserts that Wells et al. discloses a display 20. The Examiner fails to provide any portion of any reference that discloses or suggests an edit images menu that allows pixel-wise editing of images as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner asserts in his rejection of claim 5 that GCSPM discloses images being rotated, cropped, color adjusted or resized. However, this is not an edit images menu where the edit images menu allows pixel-wise editing of images, as recited in the claims of

the present application. The Examiner summarily states that "resizing can be performed on a pixel-by-pixel basis in which new width and depth parameter are specified for an image to be re-sized", but provides no portion of any reference supporting this assertion.

In addition, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to combine Hawkins et al. with GCSPM since at the time of filing this patent application, the difference between a screen on a PDA and screens on mobile phones were quite different. A PDA generally has big touch-sensitive display, whereas in contrast, a mobile phone has a small, ITU-T like key mat. One navigates around using the touch-sensitive display on a PDA whereas in contrast, one navigates on a cellular phone using the keys. Further, processor power and memory storage, etc., were quite different from a mobile phone as opposed to a PDA at the time of the filing of this patent application. Therefore, Applicants submit that at the filing of this patent application, one of ordinary skill in the art would think in mobile phone terms, and would not consider or have any motivation of combining the additional resources associated with a PDA to a mobile phone, since a PDA is significantly different from a mobile phone. The limitations in the claims of the present application relate to a wireless handheld communication device, therefore, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation, given a wireless handheld communication device, to combine it with a much more powerful and resourceful PDA. A mobile phone is voice-centric, whereas in contrast, a PDA is data-centric. A PDA typically includes items such as calendar information, notes,

games, office tools, etc., and may include GIF animation tools. In contrast, a wireless handheld communication device (e.g., mobile phone) is voice-centric and one would have no motivation to combine GIF animation tools on this type of device.

Regarding claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14 and 18, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 8 and 17 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims. Applicants submit that Hawkins et al., GCSPM and GCSPH do not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Wells et al. For example, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the sequence of images being displayed repeatedly for a number of times, a user of the handheld communication device sets the number of times the display of the sequence of images is to be repeated.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 2, 5-7, 9, 12-14, 17 and 18 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wells et al. in view of Hawkins et al. and GCSPM and further in view of AAPA. Applicants submit that claims 3 and 4 are dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that neither Hawkins et al., GCSPM, nor AAPA overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Wells et al. For

example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest a handheld communication device comparing a number of times the display of the sequence of images is to be repeated with a predetermined number, and if the number of times the display of the sequence of images is to be repeated exceeds the predetermined number, the handheld communication device only repeats the display sequence a predetermined number of times.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 3 and 4 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-18 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 10/078,372

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 367.41185X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



---

Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb  
(703) 312-6600